On the proof of the Thin Sandwich Conjecture in arbitrary dimensions.

R. Avalos, F. Dahia, C. Romero and J. H. Lira.

Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal da Paraíba,

Caixa Postal 5008, 58059-970 João Pessoa, PB, Brazil.

E-mail: rodrigo.avalos@fisica.ufpb.br; fdahia@fisica.ufpb.br;

cromero@fisica.ufpb.br; jorge.lira@mat.ufc.br

arXiv:1703.07899v1 [gr-qc] 23 Mar 2017

Abstract

In this paper we show the validity, under certain geometric conditions, of Wheeler's thin sandwich conjecture for higher dimensional theories of gravity. The results we present here are an extension of the results already shown by R. Bartnik and G. Fodor for the 3-dimensional case [1]. In spite of the geometric restrictions needed for the proofs, we show that on any compact n-dimensional manifold, $n \geq 3$, there is an open set in the space of solutions of the constraint equations where all these properties are satisfied.

I. INTRODUCTION

As is well known, the Cauchy problem for general relativity consists in finding a solution of the Einstein equations in a 4-dimensional Lorentzian manifold, which satisfies some prescribed initial conditions on a 3-dimensional Riemannian hypersurface. This can be understood as studying whether we can propagate some initial space-like hypersurface, such that the resulting space-time satisfies the Einstein equations. This problem has long been studied and there are results which show that general relativity has a well-posed Cauchy problem for initial data satisfying some constraint equations. This implies that we cannot arbitrarily give the initial data set for the Cauchy problem, motivating the study of this set of constraint equations so as to determine under what conditions it has a solution, and what part of this data can in fact be given arbitrarily on the initial manifold. It is customary to regard this system as a system of partial differential equations for a Riemannian metric and for some $(0, 2)$ symmetric tensor field defined on this Riemannian hypersurface, which in the end will play the role of the extrinsic curvature. We now know that, under some hypotheses on the topology of the space-like manifold, we can specify a conformal metric to the physical one (that is the one which will solve the constraints and hence will have a development in space-time) and the trace of the second fundamental form, and then get a well-posed system for the remaining undetermined quantities [2]. Another way to look at this problem was proposed by Wheeler. His idea was to consider space-time as a curve in what he called Superspace [3]. Given a 3-dimensional manifold M, the Superspace $S(M)$ related to it would be the space of *geometries* that can be defined on M. That is, each point in $S(M)$ would be a pair (M, g) with g a Riemannian metric defined on M. Then we can think of space-time as a curve in Superspace. In this context Wheeler proposed the Thin Sandwich Problem (TSP) [4], where the idea is to give as initial data a Riemannian metric g and a tangent vector $\partial_t g$ to (M, g), and then study whether we can solve the constraint equations for these initial data. If we can, then these initial data has a unique Cauchy development in space-time. This means that there would be a unique curve in Superspace satisfying these initial conditions and compatible with the Einstein equations. This problem has been recently investigated by some authors [1],[5],[6]. In this paper, we will be particularly interested in the results obtained by Bartnik and Fodor, who, for the 3-dimensional case, which is the arena of classical general relativity, have established sufficient conditions

for the TSP to be well-posed [1]. On the other hand, the Cauchy problem for general relativity can be formulated in arbitrary dimensions, and this is also the case for the problem of the constraint equations in its classical formulation [2]. Thus, given the present interest in higher-dimensional theories of gravity, we find that the study of the TSP in arbitrary dimensions presents a mathematically interesting and physically relevant object of study. The establishing of the n-dimensional analog ($n \geq 3$) of the Bartnik-Fodor theorem will be the content of the present paper [1].

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

The Cauchy problem for general relativity (GR) consists in the following. Given an initial data set (M, g, K) where M is an n-dimensional smooth Riemannian manifold with metric g and K is a symmetric second rank tensor field, a development of this initial data set is a space-time $(V, \bar{g})$, such that there exists an embedding into $\iota : M \mapsto V$ with the following properties:

i) The metric g is the pullback of $\bar{g}$ by the embedding ι, that is $\iota^* \bar{g} = g$.

ii) The image by ι of K is the second fundamental form of $\iota(M)$ as a submanifold of (V, g).

In the Cauchy problem for GR we look for a development of an initial data set such that the resulting space-time satisfies the Einstein equations. It is customarily assumed that $V = M \times \mathbb{R}$. Since this is a consequence of global hyperbolicity we do not regard it as a physical obstruction, and thus we will adopt this usual setting.

At this point, to study the Cauchy problem, it is customary to consider an $(n+1)$-dimensional space-time $(V, \bar{g})$ and then make an "$(n+1)$-splitting" for the metric $\bar{g}$. This means that we consider local co-frames where we can write the metric $\bar{g}$ in a convenient way, such that we have a "space-time splitting". In order to do this, a vector field β, which is constructed so as to be tangent to each hypersurface $M \times \{t\}$, is used to define the following local frame

$$e_i = \partial_i \ , \quad i = 1, \cdots, n$$
$$e_0 = \partial_t - \beta$$

and its dual coframe

$$\theta^i = dx^i + \beta^i dt \ , \quad i = 1, \cdots, n$$
$$\theta^0 = dt$$

Then we can write the metric $\bar{g}$ in the following way

$$\bar{g} = -N^2 \theta \otimes \theta + g_{ij} \theta^i \otimes \theta^j$$

where the function N is a positive function referred to as the *lapse* function, while the vector field β is called the *shift* vector.

In this adapted frame, the second fundamental form on each $M \times \{t\}$ takes the form

$$K_{ij} = \frac{1}{2N}(\partial_t g_{ij} - (\nabla_i \beta_j + \nabla_j \beta_i)) \tag{1}$$

where ∇ denotes the induced connection in M compatible with the induced metric g.

As we have already noted, the possibility of finding an Einstenian development of an initial data set depends on whether the following set of constraint equations are satisfied by these initial data:

$$R_g - |K|_g^2 + (\mathrm{tr}_g K)^2 \ = 2\epsilon \tag{2}$$
$$\mathrm{div} K - \nabla \mathrm{tr}_g K \ = S \tag{3}$$

where (ϵ, S) denote the induced energy and momentum densities on M, respectively, R_g represents the scalar curvature of g, $|\cdot|_g$ denotes the pointwise-tensor norm in the metric g and $\mathrm{div} K$ denotes the divergence of K. In coordinates, these equations become:

$$R_g - K^{ij} K_{ij} + (K_i^i)^2 \ = 2\epsilon \tag{4}$$
$$\nabla_j K_i^j - \nabla_i K_j^j \ = S_i \tag{5}$$

These equations are considered on a particular initial hypersurface $M = M \times \{t\}$, for example, in the hypersurface defined by $t = 0$. If our initial data set (M, g, K) satisfies these constraints, then it can be shown that there is an Einstenian development in our space-time V [2].

Equations (4)-(5) are generally posed as a set of equations for g and K. In the context of Wheeler's TSP these equations are looked as equations for N and β. In order to do this,

we use (1) to express (4)-(5) in terms of the lapse and shift, and then look for solutions with some prescribed data $(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$, where $\dot{g} = \partial_t g$.

In the scenario of the TSP, suppose that, given some prescribed data $(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$, we have a solution (N, β) for the constraint equations. Furthermore, suppose this solution satisfies $2\epsilon - R_g \neq 0$ over all M. Then, introducing (1) in (4) we can equate the lapse function in terms of the shift vector and the prescribed data. After doing this we obtain

$$N = \sqrt{\frac{(\mathrm{tr}_g\gamma)^2 - |\gamma|_g^2}{2\epsilon - R_g}} \tag{6}$$

where the tensor γ has components

$$\gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\big(\dot{g}_{ij} - (\nabla_i\beta_j + \nabla_j\beta_i)\big). \tag{7}$$

Replacing (6) in (5) shows that the shift vector satisfies the following equation

$$\nabla_i\left(\sqrt{\frac{2\epsilon - R_g}{(\mathrm{tr}_g\gamma)^2 - |\gamma|_g^2}}\,\big(\gamma_j^i - \delta_j^i \mathrm{tr}_g\gamma\big)\right) = S_j, \tag{8}$$

that is,

$$\mathrm{div}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2\epsilon - R_g}{(\mathrm{tr}_g\gamma)^2 - |\gamma|_g^2}}\,\big(\gamma - \mathrm{tr}_g\gamma\, g\big)\right) = S. \tag{9}$$

We have a converse procedure to the one just described. That is, if, for a given initial data set $(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$, (8) is well-posed and β is a solution of (8), then taking (6) as a definition, the lapse will satisfy (4).

It is worth to point out that the equations (9) have a variational origin (see [1] and [5]). In particular, the first detailed treatment of the thin-sandwich problem was made using this variational formulation [5]. There, some uniqueness and non-existence results were shown.

We can now state the problem we want to study here. Given a solution (N, β) of the constraint equations obtained from some given data $(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$, can we obtain a solution of the constraint equations for data "sufficiently near" of these given data? We will show that, under certain hypotheses, this can be answered affirmatively. Note that, proving that for any set of initial data sufficiently near to $(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$ there is a unique solution of the constraint equations, also proves that for this data there exists a unique Cauchy development in space-time, and this, in turn, would prove a restricted form of Wheeler's thin sandwich conjecture.[1]

[1] When we say that the quantity $\dot{g}$ is a given datum, we mean that some symmetric $(0, 2)$ tensor field on M

III. MAIN RESULTS

As we have stated above, we need to study whether any initial data set $(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$ sufficiently near to a reference solution of the constraint equations also satisfies the constraint equations. In order to do this, we can concentrate ourselves to answer this question just for the set of equations (8). To do this, we will assume M to be compact (without boundary) and write this set of non-linear PDE for the shift vector in the following way. Let

$$H_s(T^p_q(M)), \quad s > \frac{n}{2},\ s > 2,$$

the space of (p, q)-tensor fields in M with local components in the Sobolev space $H_s(\Omega)$, where Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Denote

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \doteq H_{s+3}(T^0_2 M) \times H_{s+1}(T^0_2 M) \times H_{s+1}(M) \times H_s(T^0_1 M)$$

which is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}_1} : \mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$||(g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)||_{\mathcal{E}_1} = \|g\|_{H_{s+3}} + \|\dot{g}\|_{H_{s+1}} + \|\epsilon\|_{H_{s+1}} + \|S\|_{H_s}$$

and let

$$\mathcal{E}_2 \doteq H_{s+2}(T^1_0 M) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F} \doteq H_s(T^0_1 M).$$

Now suppose that for given data $\psi_0 \doteq (g_0, \dot{g}_0, \epsilon_0, S_0) \in \mathcal{E}_1$ we have a solution $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{E}_2$. Then, the continuity of all the maps involved guarantees that (8) is well-defined in a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of (ψ_0, β_0) in $\mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2$. With this in mind, we define the map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2 \to \mathcal{F}$$

given by

$$\Phi(\psi, \beta) \doteq \operatorname{div}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2\epsilon - R_g}{(\operatorname{tr}_g\gamma)^2 - |\gamma|^2_g}}\,\big(\gamma - \operatorname{tr}_g\gamma\, g\big)\right) - S \tag{10}$$

where we have denoted $\psi = (g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S)$, and we are using β to denote the shift. Then (8) can be written as

$$\Phi(\psi, \beta) = 0. \tag{11}$$

is given, and that with this tensor field we construct K from (1), taking this tensor field as $\partial_t g_{ij}$. Then if we have a solution for the Cauchy problem, this tensor field will coincide with $\partial_t g_{ij}$ on $M \times \{0\}$.

Now our problem reduces to the following: we want to see if there are open sets $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{E}_1$, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{E}_2$, with $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}$, and a unique map

$$g : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$$

such that

$$\Phi(\psi, g(\psi)) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \psi \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Notice that, in this case, $\beta = g(\psi) \in \mathcal{W}$ would be the solution to our problem. In order to address this issue, we intend to use the Implicit Function Theorem. Hence, we need to show that

$$L = \left.\frac{\delta \Phi}{\delta \beta}\right|_{(\psi_0, \beta_0)} : \mathcal{E}_2 \to \mathcal{F} \tag{12}$$

is an isomorphism. This is precisely the procedure followed in [1] in the 3-dimensional case. We will extend their results for arbitrary dimensions ($n \geq 3$). Using (10), we compute

$$L\mathcal{Y} = \left.\frac{\delta \Phi}{\delta \beta}\right|_{(\psi, \beta)} = \mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} g - {}^{S}\nabla \mathcal{Y} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon - R_g}\langle \pi, \nabla \mathcal{Y}\rangle \pi\right)\right) \tag{13}$$

where π is the tensor

$$\pi \doteq \frac{1}{N}(\gamma - \mathrm{tr}_g \gamma \, g) = K - \mathrm{tr}_g K g \tag{14}$$

and

$${}^{S}\nabla_i \mathcal{Y}_j = \frac{1}{2}\big(\nabla_i \mathcal{Y}_j + \nabla_j \mathcal{Y}_i\big)$$

We will study the properties of the linearized operator L. First of all, it is clear that L is a linear second order operator. We now have the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *If π is a definite operator all over M, then the linear operator L is elliptic.*

Proof. The first thing we need to do is to compute the symbol of the linear operator L. We easily verify that the symbol of L is given by

$$(\sigma(L)(\xi) \cdot \mathcal{Y})^j = \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{1}{2}\xi^j \xi_k - \frac{1}{2}|\xi|_g^2 \delta_k^j - \frac{1}{2\epsilon - R_g}\pi^{ij}\xi_i \pi_k^\ell \xi_\ell\right)\mathcal{Y}^k,$$

for all $\xi \in \Gamma(T^*M)$ and $\mathcal{Y} \in \Gamma(TM)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \sigma(L)(\xi) \cdot \mathcal{Y}, \xi\rangle = (\sigma(L)(\xi) \cdot \mathcal{Y})^j \xi_j &= \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{1}{2}|\xi|_g^2\langle \xi, \mathcal{Y}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|\xi|_g^2\langle \xi, \mathcal{Y}\rangle - \frac{1}{2\epsilon - R_g}\pi(\xi,\xi)\pi(\xi, \mathcal{Y})\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\epsilon - R_g}\pi(\xi,\xi)\pi(\xi, \mathcal{Y})\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\mathcal{Y} \in T_pM$ such that $\sigma(L)(\xi) \cdot \mathcal{Y} = 0$. Then

$$\pi(\xi, \xi)\pi(\xi, \mathcal{Y}) = 0 \tag{15}$$

for all $\xi \neq 0$. Since, by assumption, π is definite and hence non-degenerate, this implies that $\mathcal{Y} = 0$. Thus L is elliptic. □

From now on, we will suppose that π gives a definite operator at every point of M so that the last proposition holds. Having in mind that our aim is to establish sufficient conditions so that L is an isomorphism, the ellipticity condition just established shows that what we need to do is to show the injectivity of both L and its formal adjoint L^*. A straightforward computation, using integration by parts, gives us that L is (formally) self-adjoint. This means that for all smooth vector fields $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ the following holds

$$\int_M \langle L\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}\rangle \, \mathrm{d}M_{g_0} = \int_M \langle \mathcal{Y}, L\mathcal{Z}\rangle \, \mathrm{d}M_{g_0},$$

where $\mathrm{d}M_{g_0}$ is the Riemannian volume element in M induced by the metric g_0. Thus, if π is a definite operator on M, then L is a (formally) self-adjoint elliptic operator, and what we need to establish is its injectivity, which is the content of the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Consider a reference solution (ψ, β) for the TSP on a compact n-dimensional manifold M satisfying that:* i) *π is a definite operator on M;* ii) *$2\epsilon - R_g > 0$ on M;* iii) *given a function μ, the equation*

$$^S\nabla \mathcal{Y} = \mu K \tag{16}$$

has only the solution $\mathcal{Y} = 0$, $\mu = 0$. Then L is injective.

Proof. Recall that

$$L\mathcal{Y} = \mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\, g - \frac{1}{2}\pounds_{\mathcal{Y}} g - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle \pi, \nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle \pi\right)\right) \tag{17}$$

Let Ω be a relatively compact open subset in M and let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ in $\Omega' \subset \Omega$. Denoting $\mathcal{Z} = \eta\mathcal{Y}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle L\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}\rangle &= Z^j \nabla_i \left(\frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\, \delta^i_j - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_j \mathcal{Y}^i + \nabla^i \mathcal{Y}_j) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle \pi, \nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle \pi^i_j\right)\right) \\
&= \nabla_i \left(\frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\, \delta^i_j - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_j \mathcal{Y}^i + \nabla^i \mathcal{Y}_j) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle \pi, \nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle \pi^i_j\right) Z^j\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\, \delta^i_j - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_j \mathcal{Y}^i + \nabla^i \mathcal{Y}_j) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle \pi, \nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle \pi^i_j\right) \nabla_i Z^j
\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\langle L\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}\rangle = \mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{N}\left(\mathcal{Z}\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} - \frac{1}{2}\pounds_{\mathcal{Y}} g(\mathcal{Z},\cdot) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle\pi(\mathcal{Z},\cdot)\right)\right) - \frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Z} - \langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Z}\rangle - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Z}\rangle\right).$$

We conclude that

$$\int_\Omega \langle L\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}M = \int_{\partial\Omega}\frac{1}{N}\left(\langle\mathcal{Z},\nu\rangle\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} - \frac{1}{2}\pounds_{\mathcal{Y}} g(\mathcal{Z},\nu) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle\langle\pi(\mathcal{Z}),\nu\rangle\right)\mathrm{d}\partial M - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Z} - \langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Z}\rangle - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Z}\rangle\right)\mathrm{d}M.$$

where ν stands for the outward normal to ∂M. Since the integrand of the first term in the right-hand side vanishes at the boundary, it follows that, if $L\mathcal{Y} = 0$, then

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{N}\left(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Z} - \langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Z}\rangle - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Z}\rangle\right)\mathrm{d}M = 0. \tag{18}$$

In particular on $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega'} \frac{1}{N}\left(\langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle - (\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle^2\right)\mathrm{d}M = 0. \tag{19}$$

Now define

$$I \doteq \langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle - (\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle^2. \tag{20}$$

Since (ψ,β) gives a reference solution for the constraint equations, using (4) we know that

$$\frac{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2}{2\epsilon - R} = 1.$$

We note that

$$\langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle {}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y},{}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle = |{}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y}|_g^2$$

and

$$\langle\pi,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle\pi,{}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle.$$

We also have

$$\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} = g^{ij}\nabla_i\mathcal{Y}_j = \langle g,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle.$$

and

$$\langle K,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle K,{}^{S}\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle.$$

Note that since π is definite, then $|K|_g \neq 0$. Thus we denote

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle \nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle$$

and rewrite (20) above as

$$\begin{aligned} I &= |{}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + 2\lambda\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle - \lambda^2 |K|_g^2 - (\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle \pi, \nabla \mathcal{Y}\rangle^2 \\ &= |{}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + 2\frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 - \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 - (\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\langle \pi, \nabla \mathcal{Y}\rangle^2. \end{aligned}$$

However, since

$$\pi = K - \mathrm{tr}K\, g$$

and

$$\langle \pi, \nabla \mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle K, \nabla \mathcal{Y}\rangle - \mathrm{tr}K\langle g, \nabla \mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle - \mathrm{tr}K\, \mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y},$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} I &= |{}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 - (\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - R}\big(\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 - 2\mathrm{tr}K\, \mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle + (\mathrm{tr}K)^2(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2\big). \end{aligned}$$

Using again the fact that

$$2\varepsilon - R = (\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} I &= |{}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + \left(\frac{1}{|K|_g^2} + \frac{1}{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2}\right)\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 + \left(\frac{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2}{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2} - 1\right)(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{2\varepsilon - R}\mathrm{tr}K\, \mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} I &= |{}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + \frac{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2}{|K|^2((\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2)}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 + \frac{|K|_g^2}{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2}(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2}\mathrm{tr}K\, \mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\langle {}^S\nabla \mathcal{Y}, K\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}((\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2)\, I = ((\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2)|{}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + \frac{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2}{|K|_g^2}\langle {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 + |K|_g^2(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 \\ - 2\mathrm{tr}K\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\langle {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle \\ = ((\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|_g^2)|{}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} - \lambda K|_g^2 + \frac{(\mathrm{tr}K)^2}{|K|_g^2}\langle {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle^2 + |K|_g^2(\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y})^2 \\ - 2\frac{\mathrm{tr}K}{|K|_g}|K|_g\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y}\langle {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$((\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|^2)\, I = ((\mathrm{tr}K)^2 - |K|^2)\left|{}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} - \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle K\right|_g^2 + \left(|K|_g\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} - \frac{\mathrm{tr}K}{|K|_g}\langle {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle\right)^2.$$

Using this in (19), we get the following

$$\int_{\Omega'}\frac{1}{N}|{}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} - \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle K|_g^2\mathrm{d}M_g + \int_{\Omega'}\frac{1}{(2\epsilon - R)N}\left(|K|_g\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} - \frac{\mathrm{tr}K}{|K|_g}\langle {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle\right)^2\mathrm{d}M_g = 0. \tag{21}$$

Since, by hypothesis, $2\epsilon - \overline{R} > 0$, then both integrands are non-negative, thus, for the equality to hold, both must equal zero. From the first integral, we get that

$${}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} = \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle K \tag{22}$$

Taking traces we get

$$\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} = \frac{1}{|K|_g^2}\langle\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle\mathrm{tr}K$$

and multiplying by $|K|_g$ we obtain

$$|K|_g\,\mathrm{div}\mathcal{Y} = \frac{\mathrm{tr}K}{|K|_g}\langle\nabla\mathcal{Y}, K\rangle.$$

which proves that (21) holds if and only if (22) holds. This shows that if $\mathcal{Y} \in \ker L$ then $\mathcal{Y}$ satisfies (22). The converse for this statement is also true. If we consider a field $\mathcal{Y}$ which satisfies (22), after some computations, we get that $L\mathcal{Y} = 0$. So if (22) has only the trivial solution $\mathcal{Y} = 0$, then L is injective. □

Using these results and the implicit function theorem we prove the following

Theorem 1. *Suppose* $(\psi_0, \beta_0) \in \mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2$ *satisfies* $\Phi(\psi_0, \beta_0) = 0$. *Then if* π *is a definite operator at each point of* M, $2\epsilon - R_g > 0$ *everywhere on* M, *and if for a given function* μ *on* M *the equation*

$$^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} = \mu K$$

has only the solution $\mathcal{Y} = 0$, $\mu = 0$, *then there are open neighbourhoods* $V \subset \mathcal{E}_1$ *and* $W \subset \mathcal{E}_2$ *of* ψ_0 *and* β_0 *respectively, and a unique mapping*

$$g : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$$

such that $\Phi(\psi, g(\psi)) = 0$ *for all* $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$.

Notice that this theorem shows that given an initial data set $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{E}_1$ for which a solution β_0 of the reduced constraint equations $\Phi(\psi, \beta) = 0$ exists, if the conditions stated in the theorem are satisfied, then for every $\psi \in \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{E}_1$ there is a unique solution of the reduced constraint equations. Then taking lapse defined as in (6), we get a solution of the full constraint equations. This answers our original question.

At this point, we would like to show that the conditions stated in the previous theorem are not too restrictive. By this we mean that, generically, there are solutions of the constraint equations satisfying all these conditions. With this in mind, notice that, given a solution (g, K) for (4)-(5) satisfying all the hypotheses of the previous theorem, we can use this solution obtained in the usual way, to obtain a reference solution for the TSP. In order to do this, just consider any given $N \in H_s$, $N > 0$, and $\beta \in \mathcal{E}_2$ and take

$$\dot{g}_{ij} \doteq 2NK_{ij} + (\nabla_i\beta_j + \nabla_j\beta_i). \tag{23}$$

Then the set $((g, \dot{g}, \epsilon, S), \beta)$ gives a reference solution of the constraint equations. Thus, what we need to show is that the constraint equations (4)-(5) on a compact manifold M always admit a solution (g, K), satisfying all the hypotheses of the theorem. A first step in this direction is the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *Suppose* (M, g) *is a an* n*-dimensional compact Riemannian manifold. Suppose that* (g, K) *satisfy the constraint equations* (4) *and* (5), *where* K *is a* $(0, 2)$ *tensor field, and suppose that* $2\epsilon - R_g > 0$ *on* M. *Then, if the Ricci tensor on* M *is negative definite, the equation* $^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} = \mu K$ *has only the trivial solution* $\mathcal{Y} = 0$ *and* $\mu = 0$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{Y}$ and μ satisfy ${}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} = \mu K$. From the definition of the curvature tensor we get the following

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ij}\mathcal{Y}^j &= \nabla_j\nabla_i\mathcal{Y}^j - \nabla_i\nabla_j\mathcal{Y}^j \\ &= 2\nabla_j{}^S\nabla_i\mathcal{Y}^j - \nabla_j\nabla^j\mathcal{Y}_i - \nabla_i(\mu K_j^j) \\ &= 2\nabla_j(\mu K_i^j) - \nabla_j\nabla^j\mathcal{Y}_i - \nabla_i(\mu K_j^j). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$R_{ij}\mathcal{Y}^j\mathcal{Y}^i = 2\mathcal{Y}^i\nabla_j(\mu K_i^j) - \mathcal{Y}^i\nabla_j\nabla^j\mathcal{Y}_i - \mathcal{Y}^i\nabla_i(\mu K_j^j)$$

We can write this last expression in the following way, which is globally defined:

$$\mathrm{Ric}_g(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}) = 2\,\mathrm{div}(\mu K)\cdot\mathcal{Y} - \langle\mathcal{Y},\Delta\mathcal{Y}\rangle - \langle\nabla\mathrm{tr}_g\,\mu K,\mathcal{Y}\rangle. \tag{24}$$

In this last expression, Δ stands for the connection Laplacian defined by $\mathrm{tr}_g\nabla^2$. From the previous expression we get that

$$\int_M \big(\mathrm{Ric}_g(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}) + \langle\mathcal{Y},\Delta\mathcal{Y}\rangle + \langle\nabla\mathrm{tr}_g K,\mathcal{Y}\rangle - 2\,\mathrm{div}(\mu K)\cdot\mathcal{Y}\big)\,\mathrm{d}M_g = 0 \tag{25}$$

Applying divergence theorem, we get

$$\int_M (\mathrm{Ric}_g(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}) - |\nabla\mathcal{Y}|_g^2 - \mu^2((\mathrm{tr}_g K)^2 - |K|_g^2) + \mu\langle K,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle\big)\,\mathrm{d}M_g = 0 \tag{26}$$

Now we will analyze the second and fourth terms in the integrand. In order to do this, we rewrite these expressions in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla\mathcal{Y}|_g^2 - \langle\mu K,\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle &= \langle\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle - \langle{}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle\nabla\mathcal{Y} - {}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle \\ &= \langle{}^A\nabla\mathcal{Y},\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle = \langle{}^A\nabla\mathcal{Y},{}^A\nabla\mathcal{Y}\rangle \\ &= |{}^A\nabla\mathcal{Y}|_g^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$${}^A\nabla_i\mathcal{Y}_j = \nabla_i\mathcal{Y}_j - {}^S\nabla_i\mathcal{Y}_j = \frac{1}{2}\big(\nabla_i\mathcal{Y}_j - \nabla_j\mathcal{Y}_i\big).$$

Then, (26) can be rewritten as

$$\int_M (\mathrm{Ric}_g(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}) - |{}^A\nabla\mathcal{Y}|_g^2 - \mu^2(2\epsilon - R_g)\big)\,\mathrm{d}M_g = 0 \tag{27}$$

Thus, if Ric_g is negative definite, then the integrand is non-positive. Hence in order for the last equality to hold, each term in the integrand has to equal zero. So the only possible $\mathcal{Y}$ and μ which can satisfy ${}^S\nabla\mathcal{Y} = \mu K$ under these geometric conditions are $\mathcal{Y} = 0$, $\mu = 0$. □

This proposition implies that, given a solution of the constraint equations (g_0, K_0) satisfying $2\epsilon - R > 0$, then, if π is a definite operator on M, and Ric_{g_0} is negative definite, then the linearization $L = \frac{\delta\Phi}{\delta\beta}\big|_{(\psi_0,\beta_0)}$ is an isomorphism and Theorem 1 applies. A 3-dimensional version of the previous proposition was shown in [1].

We will now show that any compact n-dimensional manifold admits a solution of the constraint equations satisfying all the hypotheses of Theorem 1. The first step in this direction is to look for a solution of the constraint equations of the form $(h, \alpha h)$, with h being a Riemannian metric and α a positive constant. That is, we are considering $K = \alpha h$ from the beginning. We will restrict ourselves to solutions of (4)-(5) with $S = 0$, i.e, with zero momentum density. With this set up, equation (5) is automatically satisfied and we just need to consider equation (4), which, under these conditions, becomes the following equation, which is posed for h:

$$R_h = 2\epsilon - \alpha^2 n(n-1). \tag{28}$$

In order to guarantee the existence of solutions for (28), we will appeal to the following well-established theorem:

Theorem 2. *Let M be a C^∞ compact manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. If $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is negative somewhere, then there is a C^∞ Riemannian metric on M with f as its scalar curvature.*

This theorem was proved by Kazdan and Warner [7], and its proof can also be found in [8]. Using this theorem, we see that, if the right-hand side of (28) is negative somewhere, then, for smooth sources ($\epsilon \in C^\infty$), we have that (28) always admits a smooth solution. In order to guarantee this last condition, just take $\alpha > \min \frac{2\epsilon}{n(n-1)}$. A solution constructed in this way satisfies two of the three conditions required by Theorem 1, that is, it satisfies

- $2\epsilon - R_h > 0$, which comes from (28).
- π is negative definite, since from $K = \alpha h$ we get that $\pi = \alpha(1-n)h$.

In this context, the last condition of Theorem 1 becomes the statement that h does not admit conformal Killing fields. We will show that we can always find a solution h of (28) with this property. In order to do this, we need to make a remark on how Theorem 2 is

proved[2]. The proof of this theorem begins with the statement that we can choose on M a Riemannian metric g', with $R_{g'} = -1$, which is something known from [9], and then one finds a conformal metric to g' satisfying the theorem. In fact, it is shown that h has the following form:

$$h = (\phi^{-1})^*(u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g') \tag{29}$$

where u is a positive function and ϕ is a suitably chosen diffeomorphism. In this process, we claim that we can choose g' without conformal Killing fields. We support this claim using the results shown by Lohkamp in [10]. There, it is shown that every manifold M of dimension $n \geq 3$ admits a complete metric with negative definite Ricci tensor. As a corollary of this theorem, it is shown that, starting from such a Riemannian metric g on M with negative definite Ricci tensor, we can find a conformal metric $g' = v^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$, such that $R(g') = -1$. In this way, using this metric as the starting point in the proof of Theorem 2, we get that the metric h solving (28) has the following form:

$$h = (\phi^{-1})^*(u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} v^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g) \tag{30}$$

where g has negative definite Ricci tensor. We now have the following:

Proposition 4. *The solution* (30) *obtained for* (28) *does not admit conformal Killing fields.*

Proof. It is a well-known fact that, on compact manifolds, metrics with negative definite Ricci tensor do not admit conformal Killing fields[3], which is the case of the metric g. Now, imagine that h admitted a conformal Killing field $Y \in \Gamma(TM)$, that is $\pounds_Y h = \lambda h$, for some $\lambda \in C^\infty(M)$, where $\pounds_Y h$ is the Lie derivative of h with respect to Y. From (30) we get that

$$g = (uv)^{\frac{-4}{n-2}} \phi^*(h) \doteq \mu \phi^*(h).$$

Define $X \doteq \phi_*^{-1} Y \in \Gamma(TM)$, so that $Y = \phi_* X$. We claim that under these conditions X is a conformal Killing field of g. To check this, we have to compute the Lie derivative of g with respect to X, that is

$$\pounds_X g = X(\mu)\phi^*(h) + \mu \pounds_X(\phi^* h).$$

[2] See, for example, T. Aubin, *Some Non-Linear Problems in Riemannian Geometry*, Springer, Berlin, chapter 6 (1998).

[3] See, for instance, Yvonne Choquet-Bruhat, *General Relativity and the Einstein equations*, Oxford University Press Inc., New York, chapter 7 (2009).

Using that $\pounds_X(\phi^* h) = \phi^*(\pounds_Y h)$ and the fact that Y is a conformal Killing field for h, then we get that

$$\pounds_X g = \big(X(\log\mu) + \lambda \circ \phi\big) g$$

which shows that X is a conformal Killing field for g. But this contradicts the fact that g has negative definite Ricci tensor, thus h can not admit conformal Killing fields. □

Thus, we conclude that the solution we have constructed for the constraint equations satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 1 and therefore can be used as a reference solution. Then we can state the following theorem

Theorem 3. *On any smooth compact n-dimensional manifold M, $n \geq 3$, there is an open subset in the space of solutions of the constraint equations* (4)-(5) *with $S = 0$, where the TSP is well-posed.*[4]

IV. FINAL REMARKS

In this paper we have been able to show the validity of the main results presented in [1] in arbitrary dimensions ($n \geq 3$). Specifically we have shown that Wheeler's thin sandwich conjecture is true under certain geometrical conditions in all these cases. As a novelty, we have also been able to establish that the geometric hypotheses needed to prove this result can always be satisfied in the case of zero momentum density, and thus that, in these cases, there is an open subset in the space of solutions of the constraint equations where the thin sandwich problem is well-posed. These are interesting results describing the space of solutions of the constraint equations in arbitrary dimensions. These type of results are relevant in the study of the Cauchy problem for higher dimensional theories of gravity, and they also give us a better understanding of the Superspace picture for space-time in this context. In contrast to the usual approach to the constraint equations, where the structure of the space of solutions and its relation to properties of the evolving space-time is something we understand quite well (see, for instance, [2],[12],[13]), most of these problems require further study in the context of the Superspace picture for space-time.

[4] We are assuming the same topology defined in the study of the reduced thin sandwich equations.

Acknowledgements

R. A. and C. R. would like to thank CNPq and CLAF for financial support. J. L would like to thank CNPq and FUNCAP/CNPq/PRONEX for financial support.

---

[1] R. Bartnik and G. Fodor, *On the restricted validity of the thin sandwich conjecture*, Phys. Rev. D 48, 3596-3599 (1993).

[2] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *General Relativity and the Einstein equations*, Oxford University Press Inc., New York (2009).

[3] D. Giulini, *The Superspace of Geometrodynamics*, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. 41: 785 (2009).

[4] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco (1973).

[5] E. P. Belasco and H. C. Ohanian, *Initial conditions in general relativity: Lapse and Shift Formulation*, J. Math. Phys., 10, 1503 (1969).

[6] D. Giulini, *The generalized thin-sandwich problem and its local solvability* J. Math. Phys. 40, 2470 (1999).

[7] J. Kazdan and F. Warner, *Scalar Curvature and conformal deformation of Riemannian structure*, J. Differ. Geom. 10, 113-134 (1975).

[8] T. Aubin, *Some Non-Linear Problems in Riemannian Geometry*, Springer, Berlin (1998).

[9] T. Aubin, *Metriques riemanniennes et courbure*, J. Diff. Geom. 4, 383-424 (1970).

[10] J. Lohkamp, *Metrics of negative Ricci curvature*, Ann. Math. 140, 655- 683 (1994).

[11] J. E. Marsden, T. Ratiu and R. Abraham, *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications*, Springer-Verlag Publishing Company, New York. Chapter 6. (2007).

[12] A. E. Fischer, J. E. Marsden and V. Moncrief, *The structure of the space of solutions of Einstein's equations. I. One Killing field*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré 33, 2, 147-194 (1980).

[13] R. Beig, P. T. Chruciel and R. Schoen, *KIDs are not generic*, Ann. Henri Poincaré 6: 155 (2005).